



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CR
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/053,499	01/18/2002	John A. Galbraith	02-093	3656
7590	12/23/2003		EXAMINER	
Ian K. Samways Reed Smith LLP P.O. Box 488 Pittsburgh, PA 15230-0488			PATTERSON, MARIE D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3728	
DATE MAILED: 12/23/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/053,499	GALBRAITH ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Marie Patterson	3728

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 November 2003 and 10 December 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-7 and 12-36 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-7 and 12-36 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 12.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claims 3-7, and 31-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 2-6 and 31-36 the phrases corresponding to the thickness and protrusions to the stages of compression are confusing, vague, and indefinite because it is not clear what structural limitations applicant intends to encompass with such language.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-7, 18, 20, 26, and 29-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sessa (54690639).

Sessa shows an insole comprising a base (22) with a plurality of compressible protrusions (36) and means for interconnecting the protrusions (38) which inherently provides for strict compression of the protrusions and column-buckling is avoided, i.e. the presence of 38 prevents the protrusion 36 from buckling over because it would interfere with the buckling when the protrusion hits it.

In reference to claim 29, the insole of Sessa is clearly capable of being placed, i.e. is adapted to be disposed between a foot and an insole inasmuch as applicant has claimed such.

4. Claims 1-7, 12-14, 17-26, and 29-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yung -Mao (4843741).

Yung-Mao shows an insole comprising a base (38) with a plurality of compressible protrusions (40) and means for interconnecting the protrusions (shorter elements or alternating elements 40) which inherently provides for strict compression of the protrusions and column-buckling is avoided, i.e. the close arrangement of elements 40 results in the elements abutting one another during compression which inherently avoids buckling of the elements.

In reference to claims 24 and 25, Yung-Mao shows an arch stiffener (30) at the are area shown in figure 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-6, 12-18, and 23-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Kramer (5233767) in view of Wen (5853844).

Kramer shows an insole comprising a base member (25 or 10) with a plurality of protrusions (11 and/or 20) and means for interconnecting the protrusions (alternating elements 11 or elements 21 and other height elements as discussed in column 5 lines 20-24) substantially as claimed except for the orientation of the protrusions being away from the wearer's foot. Wen teaches placing protrusions (62 and 63) on the bottom surface of a base member (6) which top surface is located directly adjacent the wearers' foot as an alternative or in addition to placing

cushioning protrusions on the upper surface of a midsole/outsole layer (2). It would have been obvious to provide the protrusions and interconnecting means on the bottom surface of an insole layer as taught by Wen in the shoe of Kramer to increase cushioning and comfort.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 11/12/03 and 12/10/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicants' arguments directed towards the prior art not being "insoles", the prior art does show insoles in that they disclosed elements which either are in contact with the wearers' foot or at least are an upper layer of a sole, i.e. the definition of an insole. There is no clear structural difference between an upper layer of a sole/midsole and an insole. Absent any further structural limitations the claims are read broadly as is reasonable.

In response to applicants' arguments directed towards the avoidance of buckling, the applied prior art clearly shows such as described above in the rejections.

In response to applicants' arguments directed towards "vectoring", since these claims are primarily functional, the prior art reads upon these claims in that forces in different directions/vectors will be responded to by the protrusions in that direction. These claims do not appear to further structurally limit the claimed subject matter and the applied prior art shows all of the positively recited structural limitations and therefore are considered to inherently function as claimed.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

1. Telephone inquiries regarding the status of application or other general questions, by persons entitled to the information, "should be directed to the group clerical personnel and not to the Examiners. In as much as the official records and applications are located in the clerical section of the examining groups, the clerical personnel can readily provide status information without contacting the examiners", M.P.E.P. 203.08. The Group clerical receptionist number is (703) 308-1148 or the **Tech Center 3700 Customer Service Center number is (703) 306-5648**. For applicant's convenience, the Group Technological Center FAX number is (703) 872-9306. (Note that the Examiner **cannot** confirm receipt of faxes) Please identify Examiner _____ of Art Unit _____ at the top of your cover sheet of any correspondence submitted.

Inquiries only concerning the **merits** of the examination should be directed to Marie Patterson whose telephone number is (703) 308-0069.

If in receiving this Office Action it is apparent to applicant that certain documents are missing, e.g. copies of references cited, form PTO-1449, for PTO-892, etc. requests for copies of such papers should be directed to (703) 308-1337.

Check out our web-site at "www.uspto.gov" for fees and other useful information.


Marie Patterson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3728

Application/Control Number: 10/053,499
Art Unit: 3728

Page 6